Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1, 2, 10, and 11, and replace the original sheets including Figures 1, 2, 10, and 11. In Figures 1, 2, and 10, a "prior art" legend has been added. In Figure 11, the equation for computing output extrinsic LLR values has been amended for consistency with corresponding amendment to the specification. Annotated sheets are not included, as the amendments will be apparent.

Attachment: Four replacement sheets including revised Figures 1, 2, 10, and 11

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.   The Examiner rejected claims 2-5 and 9-33, but indicated that claims 1 and 6-8 are allowable. Specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 2-5, 10-13, 18-21, and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite; rejected claims 9 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the Max-LogMAP algorithm; rejected claims 10, 11, 14-19, 22-24, 26, 27, and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Max-LogMAP algorithm and the prior art turbo decoder arrangement; rejected claims 12, 13, 20, 21, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Max-LogMAP algorithm and the prior art turbo decoder arrangement and in view of Pan; and rejected claims 12, 13, 20, 21, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Max-LogMAP algorithm and the prior art turbo decoder arrangement and in view of Schmookler. The Examiner objected to claims 12, 13, 20, 21, 28, and 29 for being verbose.

Applicants understand that claims 2-5 would be allowable with appropriate amendments to overcome the Examiner's objections and with appropriate amendment of the drawings to represent the use of a table of logarithm values. Applicants also believe that independent claims 9, 17, and 25 (and their respective dependent claims) should be deemed to include allowable subject matter, as they essentially parallel the elements of claim 1 (but include a short-hand representation of the output extrinsic Log Likelihood Ratio (LLR) equation that could easily be replaced with the full version from claim 1). That being said, Applicants have elected to accept the subject matter deemed allowable by the Examiner in order to proceed with allowance of the application. Therefore, claims 2-5 and 9-33 have been canceled. Applicants expressly reserve the right to pursue relinquished subject matter in one or more continuing applications. Also, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-5 and 9-33 are being canceled solely to proceed to an allowance of the application and are not being canceled to avoid any prior art or for other reasons relating to patentability.

2.   The Examiner objected to the drawings, suggesting that Figures 1 through 10 should be designated as illustrating prior art.

Figures 1, 2, and 10 have been amended to include a "prior art" legend. Applicants respectfully submit that Figures 3 through 9 do not require a "prior art" legend. Figures 4 and 5 explicitly show performance curves of a Semi-LOGMAP implementation compared to two prior art implementations. Figures 3 and 6-9 show general decoder architectural features that can be used in implementing Semi-LOGMAP and therefore are not prior art when so used.

3. The Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to show certain elements in claims 2-4, 10-12, 18-20, and 26-28.

Claims 2-4, 10-12, 18-20, and 26-28 have been canceled, eliminating the need to amend the drawings.

4. The Examiner objected to the specification due to various informalities.

The specification has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections.

5. Figure 11 has been amended for consistency with amended Equation 25.

6. All pending claims are believed to be in a form suitable for allowance. Therefore, the application is believed to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests early allowance of the application. The Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned, Jeffrey T. Klayman, if it will assist further examination of this application.

7.   The applicants do not believe any extension of time is required for timely

consideration of this response. In the event that an extension has been overlooked, this

conditional petition of extension is hereby submitted, and Applicants request that deposit

account number 19-4972 be charged for any fees that may be required for the timely

consideration of this application.

Date: January 18, 2006   Respectfully submitted,

                                                        Jeffrey T. Klayman
                                                        Registration No. 39,250
                                                        Attorney for Applicants

Bromberg & Sunstein LLP
125 Summer Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1618
Tel: (617) 443-9292
Fax: (617) 443-0004

02550/00167 458952.1